Performance Report Card Higher Education Department Fiscal Year 2010, 3rd Quarter

Performance Overview: The Higher Education Department (HED) consists of two programs, Policy Development and Institutional Financial Oversight and the Student Financial Aid. The Student Financial Aid program does not report quarterly measures because its measures focus on annual outcomes. The department finalized its strategic plan in April of 2010 that includes a comprehensive monitoring plan. Information from the plan appears to be included in the quarterly report and HED has improved the quality of its quarterly reports over last year but much of the data needed to evaluate measures is not readily gleaned from the report. The department has requested meetings to develop new measures or refine several existing measures for FY12. Quarterly measures, such as building renewal and replacement monitoring, the facility condition index status, timely special project and flow-through appropriations distributions, and review of special appropriation performance reports, are missing. The department is now reporting summary information as relates to fiscal watch and financial status data of public, post-secondary institutions but is submitting a log of report dates, rather than meaningful data to determine fiscal status and provide an alert for any potential fiscal instability.

FTE: **Higher Education** Budget: FY09 **FY10** 34.5 Perm Q1 Q2 O3 Q4 Department Rating \$26,317.9 Actual Target 19.5 Term Percent of adult basic education students who set attainment of 20% 23% 19.1% 20.6% 20.8% general educational development as a goal* Percent of properly completed capital infrastructure draws released to the state board of finance within thirty days of receip 91% 98% 97% 100% from institutions* Number of capital project reviews and approvals performed to N/A N/A insure institutional fiscal accountability and responsibility 14 Number of outreach services and related events provided to secondary schools and students related to college readiness, 4,398 4,500 1,485 295 196 college preparation curriculum, and financial aid. Percent of properly completed financial aid allocations and draw 60% 90% N/A 100% 100% downs processed within 30 days **Program Rating**

Comments: The Department is showing improvement in timely processing of capital infrastructure draws and financial aid allocations. The Department has expanded its outreach via GEAR UP and the College Access Challenge Grant; a new performance measure(s) is needed. It is unclear why the number of outreach services and related events are reduced for FY10. This will be addressed with the department to determine what corrective action is necessary to positively impact this measure.

Student Financial Aid		Budget: FTE: 0	FY09	FY10	Annual Measure				
Pro	ogram	\$80,619.8	Actual	Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Rating
6	Number of lottery success recipients enrolled in or graduated from college after the ninth semester*			3,200	N/A	N/A	N/A		
7	Percent of students meeting e programs who continue to be	81.3%	78%	N/A	N/A	N/A			
8	Percent of students meeting e programs who continue to be	73.5%	75%	N/A	N/A	N/A			
9	Percent of students meeting e programs who continue to be	63.4%	66%	N/A	N/A	N/A			
10	Percent of students meeting e programs who continue to be	64.6%	68%	N/A	N/A	N/A		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Program Rating

Comments: The department does not report performance results for measures within the Student Financial Aid program quarterly, as these are driven by the academic year. The department has indicated five strategic goals for higher education, focusing on increasing degree attainment and student success, access, and affordability, workforce development and efficiency. The agency should incorporate performance measures to track the percent of lottery students enrolled or graduated by the ninth semester, similar to measure 1 above, and additional measures to track



the default rates and collections recovery effectiveness for the program's loan for service and loan repayment programs.

* Denotes House Bill 2 measure



Performance Report Card Two-Year Independent Campuses Fiscal Year 2010, 3rd Quarter

Performance Overview: Semi-annual reports on retention rates are submitted by the New Mexico Independent Community Colleges. This report card emphasizes the reporting period fall-to-fall for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen from the initial fall semester to the subsequent fall semester.

The overall program rating reflects that only three of the eight colleges, specifically Mesalands Community College, Northern New Mexico College and San Juan College met their targets and posted increases in retention rates from the prior year. This is a significant departure from the branch colleges and may be a result of the four-year institutions shifting remedial courses to the two-year colleges. It is curious however that with the ongoing economic downturn, vocational programs are expected to be growing and persistence should be higher.

Some inconsistencies exist in reporting between universities and two-year colleges. This is a carry-over issue from prior years and will be addressed during the interim with all of the institutions to standardize data collection and reporting. This is an agenda item when staff meets with HED and the institutions to discuss FY12 measures.

Ret	tention Fall-to-Fall	Budget:	FTE:	Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2008 to Fall 2009 Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Fall 2008 to Fall 2009 Actual	Rating
1	Central New Mexico Community	College		58.5%	60.0%				56.8%	R)
2	Clovis Community College			49.5%	53.3%				39.7%	(A)
3	Luna Community College			46.2%	57.2%				41.6%	(R)
4	Mesalands Community College			60.0%	60.5%				62.8%	
5	New Mexico Junior College			38.2%	50.0%				44.8%	Y
6	Northern New Mexico College			50.9%	57.9%				57.5%	
7	San Juan College			55.5%	56.0%				58.6%	
8	Santa Fe Community College			63.2%	59.0%				58.8%	(B)
9	Western New Mexico University	(2-year programs only)							52.1	
Pre	Program Rating								Y	

Given the timing of the economic downturn, which would typically result in increases in enrollment and retention, the significant gaps in freshman student persistence relative to target needs more analysis. The colleges note a small cohort size can result in significant volatility, yet the target setting process for each institution should be somewhat sensitive to this issue. Santa Fe Community Colleges notes its student retention initiatives are impacting the freshman persistence rate. CNM notes a significant increase in the number of students who transfer to anther institution within their first year at CNM, which contributed to decreased freshman participation at that institution. Clovis Community College notes that while the population base in the Clovis area is increasing with new military personnel, long-term deployments are hampering efforts to improve persistence.

At New Mexico Junior College (NMJC), the accountability report notes that declining economic conditions are resulting in more students enrolling and staying in school. NMJC has improved retention of students' year-to-year4 but is below FY10 targets. Western New Mexico University reports that the reporting period does not include over 100 students who enrolled in mid-semester during the Spring of 2008. These students enrolled under the Trade adjustment Act and had over a 90 percent completion rate. If these students had been included in the report, the university would have exceeded its targets.



Performance Report Card Universities Fiscal Year 2010, 3rd Quarter 2009



Performance Overview: Semi-annual reports on retention rates are submitted by the Council of University Presidents. This report card emphasizes the percent of full-time, first-time freshmen who reenroll for the Spring semester.

Reporting is improved among institutions and between two- and four-year colleges over previous years. Of note is that the universities are beginning to include targets for the Fall-Spring reports although most state that in general the Fall-Spring data is used more as an indicator rather than an outcome and targets are of little use. The four-year institutions have committed to a uniform reporting format and criteria to allow for comparisons.

Retention Fall-to-Spring		Fall 2008 to Spring 2009 Actual	Fall 2009 to Spring 2010 Target	Reported Annually		Fall 2009 to Spring 2010 Actual	Rating
1	UNM freshman retention, fall to spring	91.0%	N/A			91.6%	
2	NMSU freshman retention, fall to spring	88.4%	88.2%			88.2%	4
3	NMIMT freshman retention, fall to spring	91.0%	N/A			92.2%	(D)
4	ENMU freshman retention, fall to spring	81.2%	81.5%			81.8%	
5	NMHU freshman retention, fall to spring	72.1%	77%			70.9%	R?
6	WNMU freshman retention, fall to spring	75.3%	81.5%			82.4%	
Pro	Program Rating						

Of the three research universities, UNM and NMIMT exceeded their performance from the prior year and NMSU met its target although fell a bit short of its prior year performance. Of the three comprehensive universities, Western New Mexico University and Eastern New Mexico University exceeded performance from the prior year, Western by a significant margin. Only New Mexico Highlands University failed to meet its target for the current year and continues to be significantly below the persistence rate levels of 2002 to 2006. It appears this trend may continue and appears to be troubling. While WNMU posted a notable decline in actual student persistence for FY09, the trend appears to be reversed for FY10.



Performance Report Card Two-Year Branch Campuses Fiscal Year 2010, 3rd Quarter

Performance Overview: Semi-annual reports on retention rates are submitted by the New Mexico Association of Community Colleges. This report card emphasizes the reporting period fall-to-fall for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen from the initial fall semester to the subsequent fall semester.

The overall program rating reflects an overall improvement in retaining students year to year at all but one institution. This is a marked difference from the independent community colleges where performance is inconsistent over time. It is unclear why such significant differences are noted but merits investigation to ensure best practices identified at one institution are considered and implemented at others.

Some inconsistencies exist in reporting between universities and two-year colleges. This is a carry-over issue from prior years and will be addressed during the interim with all of the institutions to standardize data collection and reporting. This is an agenda item when staff meets with HED and the institutions to discuss FY12 measures.

Retention Fall-to-Fall		Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2008 to Fall 2009 Target	Annual Measure			Fall 2008 to Fall	Rating
				Q1	Q2	Q3	2009 Actual	, and
1	ENMU Roswell	50.5%	50.1%				51.3%	
2	ENMU Ruidoso	36.7%	39.0%				44.2%	
3	NMSU Alamogordo	51.5%	52.3%				55.8%	
4	NMSU Carlsbad	46.6%	48.8%				41.2%	(R)
5	NMSU Dona Ana	65.7%	64.1%				64.9%	
6	NMSU Grants	48.9%	56.3%				68.3%	49
7	UNM Gallup	65.2%	56.0%				56.6%	
8	UNM Los Alamos	54.5%	55.5%				60.3%	
9	UNM Taos	46.4%	49.5%				60.7%	(2)
10	UNM Valencia	60.6%	55.0%				60.3%	4
Program Rating							3	

Significant enrollment growth continues at all but a few of the two-year institutions and it appears that most are demonstrating success in retaining these student into their second year. It appears that this is a function of institution efforts, the economic decline and the greater emphasis being placed on providing remedial classes to student at two-year institutions and away from the four-year institutions.

Strongest improvement was evident at Eastern New Mexico University-Ruidoso, New Mexico State University-Grants and the University of New Mexico-Taos. ENMU-Ruidoso has relatively small enrollment numbers, which can influence year-to-year results, but is indicative of strong retention activities on the campus.

		3,